[Shri Mallikarjun]

could not be deposited there. Therefore they were kept in a separate military regiment, in the magaizine, as we call it, for storing. And they were all defused and they are of no use. Actually, they have been kept for... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: But what happened ultimately?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: So, they are the defused ones. And, some of these defused arms were kept for training purposes... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI: What about other types of ammunition like rifles and other things?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: As regards whether they would be utilised on the other types of ammunition also, the hon. Member asked whether they would be utilised on the borders. No, they will not be utilised and they will be... (Interruptions).

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Why are they not being utilised?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, another question was put earlier also in this House on the same subject and a written reply was given to that question in which a reference was made to the Court of Enquiry. In the reply given today, the Court of Enquiry was not initially mentioned. But subsequently the hon. Minister mentioned about the setting up of the Court of Enquiry. In view of a number of delicate points raised in the earlier question, a fairly cautious reply was given. Does he not think that the storage for display is also some kind of a temporary storage? Since in the handling of the explosives, many other civilian employees had been employed, is it not fair on the part of the Minister or does he not deem it correct to say that he will come before the House with full details when the Court of Enquiry submits its detailed report?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Madam, the nature of the question today is slightly different from the nature of the question which was put earlier. In the question put earlier, it was asked whether any Court of Enquiry was instituted. For that reason, it has not been mentioned in the main reply. So far as the report of the Court of Enquiry is concerned, we hope that it will be submitted shortly. If the august House feels that it should be placed before it, there is no problem in placing the report before the House.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: Madam, may I know from the hon. Minister whether there have been any incidents, not of this nature? There were incidents of fire in the depots, there were incidents of deaths, etc. When the Court of Enquiry was instituted, was it established that there was any sabotage? I am not talking about the Srinagar incident. I am talking of incidents in Delhi.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Madam, apart this incident, there were other incidents also. In fact, for any reason if any explosion takes place in any depot, there is a risk for those inspecting officers who are there. Normally we don't expect such things. But for any reason if an explosion takes place, then it is an unfortunate incident. Such incidents took place earlier also.

Pending pension cases in defenct departments

*644. SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: †

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what is the total number of applications for pension to ex-armymen in defence departments;

†The Question was actually asked in the floor of the House by Shri Misa R. Ganesan.

(b) whether Government are aware that there are a lot of applications pending for grant of pension to the widows of military personnel for years together;

(c) the number of applications pending for pension to military personnel till date, Statewise; and

(d) what action Government propose to take to expedite these cases?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

Details of pension claims in respect of Armed Force personnel received and disposed by various pension sanctioning authorities during the year 1993-94 (April-March) and claims pending as on 31-3-1994 are as under:—

Nature of claims	No. of clpims received	No. of claims where Pension Payment Orders issued	No. of claims rejected/ returned	No. of claims pending as on 31-3-94
1. *Retiring Pension:*				
(Commissioned officers)				
(i) Army	1908	1794	..	114
(ii) Navy	242	242	..	
(iii) Air Force	657	518	..	
2. *Service Pension:*				
(Personnel below officer rank)				
(i) Army	46161	45,02	974	
(ii) Navy	1940	1940	..	..
(iii) Air Force	5464	5603	..	861
3. *Disability Pension:*	30290	19274	7.59	395
4. *Family Pension:*	14929	11152	1745	2032

The State-wise details of pension applications are not maintained.

Normally delays do not occur in sanctioning family pension to the families of those Armed Forces personnel who retired or died on or after 1.1.64. Delays do occur in cases involving families of those personnel who had retired or died prior to 1-1-64 because the scheme of family pension was extended to them only in August, 1985. Due to passage of time the claimants find it difficult to furnish the necessary details for preparation of their claims.

Special efforts are, however, made to verify the claims of such family pensioners with reference to the available records. Where it is not possible to fully establish the claim with reference to records, but the claimant is able to produce some collateral evidence, family

pension is sanctioned on the basis of such collateral evidence after obtaining an affidavit from the claimant.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: Madam, In the reply itself, the Minister admits that normally delays don't occur in sanctioning family pension to the families of those Armed Forces personnel who retired or died on or before 1-1-1964. He himself admits that there are cases prior to 1964 which are still pending with the Defence Ministry. It is now 1994. Thirty years have elapsed. A lot of applications which were made prior to 1964 are still pending with the Defence Ministry. In the statement given, it has been stated that in respect of family pension, the number of claims received is 14,929, the number of claims where pension payment orders were issued is 11.152, the number of claims rejected or returned is 1,745 and the number of claims pending as on 31-3-1994 is 2,032. I would like to know from the hon. Minister the number of cases prior to 1-1-1964 which are still pending because we are in 1994 and thirty years have elapsed. I want to have a specific answer as to how many cases prior to 1-1-1964 are pending. This is my first supplementary.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: It is true that some cases prior to 1-1-1964 are pending. In fact, the hon. Member himself has referred to a case of Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma. I think he remembers.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Which Lakshmikanthmma.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Not our Lakshmikanthmma.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: What is this 'our'?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, she is a very special person.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: 'Our means from 'our State.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: She is not only from our State, but once she was also a Member of Parliament of the other House. So, she remains ours.

SHRI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: She is an ex-Member of Lok Sabha from Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Whether Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha, they are of one family.

So, in this particular case, we are trying to help, but, unfortunately, the claimant has to give certain data which she is not able to give. In fact, a reply was also sent. Again she has approached saying, 'I am not able to get any data except some pass.' So it is becoming difficult because there are certain laid-down norms for granting the pension also. And so far as the pending cases of 2,032 are concerned, they are not the pending cases of one year; they are the pending cases which have been carried forward. As far as family pelsion is concerned, the claims received are 14,929. Apart from that, till today, 1,02,591 applications have been recived—out of which, the Government has decided 85,525 cases, 9,778 cases were rejected, and 7,258 cases are pending.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Second supplementary.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: Madam, the Minister himself admits about the Lakashmikanthamma case. Madam, that poor lady is suffering like anything. She is still living in Madras. She is now 89 or 90 years old. She is suffering like anything and she is not able to get any favourable answer from the Ministry. Madam, in the latter portion of the reply given today, they have said, "special efforts are, however, made to verify the claims of such family pensioners with reference to the availble records. Where it is not possible to fully establish the claim with reference to records, but the claimant is able to produce some collateral evidence, family pension is sanctioned on the basis of such collateral evidence after obtaining an affidavit from the claimant." Here this lady is ready to give an affidavit to

that effect. But still that matter is pending. I want a specific answer for that.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Madam, in some cases, we take the collateral evidence and the pension is sanctioned. But here with Smt. Lakshmikanthamma, except a civilian pass issued, there is nothing with her. And anybody can give an affidavit. But with the affidavit there should be some collateral evidence.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: An affidavit has its own effect.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him answer.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: An affidavit is not a simple mtter. She is going before the Notary Public and saying, "all these things are true." So, that affidavit has to be given effect to.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Madam, once she can convince us a little bit—we do not want it to be 100 per cent, but there should be a convincing evidence of at least 15 per cent or 20 percent, if not aboslute—then we will certainly consider the case.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam as per the answer given the Minister under category one, only the officers are enjoying all the benefits. All the claims by them were cleared and there are no claims by them were cleared and there are no claims which were rejected. As far as the other Army personnel are concerned, especially in Item-3 you find that 7,059 years under disability pension have been rejected. I would like to know for what reasons they have been rejected.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: Madam, out of 30,290 applications for disability pension, 7593 were rejected. So, Madam; at this moment I cannot give the reasons for rejecting any specific case. But there are laid down procedures. Accordingly, they will process the cases. And when the processing of the case takes place and if it does not fit in, then it is subject to rejection.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : महोदया, मंत्री जी ने जो ब्यौरा दिया है, उसमें आप देखेंगे कि सबसे ज्यादा परिवार पेंशन के लम्बित 2032 मामले वे हैं, जो सैन्य कर्मियों की विधवाओं द्वारा दिये गये यानी वे दोहरी व्यथा की शिकार हो रही है। एक तरफ पति का आसरा छिन गया है, दूसरी तरफ सरकारी उनके पेंशन के मामले नहीं निपटा रही हैर समय बहुत कम है, इसलिए मैं इ मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूगी कि क्य इन मामलों में निजी रुचि लेकर वे सबा पहले प्राथमिकता के आधार पर इसे मामलों को निपटाने का प्रयत्न करेंगे। न

श्री मल्लिकार्जुन : महोदया, निजी रुचि लेकर इन 2032 केसेज को अति शीघ्र ही करूगा... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : आपबहुत अच्छी हिन्दी बोले।

Shankar Dayalji would be very happy.

THE Question Hour is over.

SHRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Madam,.....

उपसभापति : पेपर तो हो जाने दीजिए फिर... (व्यवधान)

जयपाल रेड्डी जी, पेपर ले हो जायें फिर उनकी बात सुनेंगे।

जी. वेंकटस्वामी जी आप बैठियेगा। कोटैया जी को कुछ कहना है। आप जाइयेगा मत।